

Serial No.: 09/698,800

REMARKS

Claims 46 and 47 are now pending in the application.

This Supplemental Response is being filed to correct an inadvertent error that occurred in one of applicants' previous responses, and to place the application in condition for allowance.

As background, applicants filed a response on December 3, 2003. The response included amendments to claims 35 and 36. The response filed on December 3, 2003 was subsequently entered by way of a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) filed on January 21, 2004.

The Examiner mailed an Office Action on February 11, 2004. In the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claims 35 and 36, as amended in the response filed on December 3, 2003, were allowed.

New claims 46 and 47, presented herein, are virtually identical to claims 35 and 36, respectively, as allowed in the Office Action mailed on February 11, 2004. The only difference is the term "perform" on line 5 of claim 35 has been changed to --preform-- to correct an obvious typographical error.

Accordingly, new claims 46 and 47 are believed to be allowable for the exact same reasons as claims 35 and 36 as indicated in the Office Action mailed on February 11, 2004. The application should therefore be in condition for allowance.

Applicants wish to point out an inadvertent error which occurred in applicants' response filed on May 11, 2004. Specifically, applicants provided a complete listing of the pending claims as required in accordance with the new amendment format set forth by the USPTO. Applicants inadvertently compiled the listing of claims from an outdated electronic compilation. This resulted in the language of claims 35 and 36 as presented in the response filed on May 11, 2004 differing slightly from claims 35 and 36 as allowed based on the response filed on December 3, 2003. Specifically, claims 35 and 36 in the response filed on May 11, 2004 referred to "A *glass material* bond ...", whereas claims 35 and 36 as allowed in the response filed on December 3, 2003 referred to "A *structure comprising* a bond ...".

Serial No.: 09/698,800

Applicants believe the above-noted error resulted in the Examiner issuing the Advisory Action mailed on August 13, 2004. Specifically, the Examiner indicated that applicants' response filed on August 3, 2004 would not be entered as there were changes to claims 35 and 36 without appropriate underlining/bracketing and possible new issues. Applicants suspect this was prompted by a comparison of claims 35 and 36 as presented in the response filed on August 3, 2004 and the incorrect claims 35 and 36 submitted in the response filed on May 11, 2004. Applicants sincerely apologize for the confusion.

In summary, this response presents new claims 46 and 47 in the same form as claims 35 and 36 as allowed in the Office Action mailed on February 11, 2004. Thus, the claims should be allowable and the application should be in condition for allowance. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone interview would be helpful to facilitate favorable prosecution of the above-identified application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

Serial No.: 09/698,800

Should a petition for an extension of time be necessary for the timely reply to the outstanding Office Action (or if such a petition has been made and an additional extension is necessary), petition is hereby made and the Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees (including additional claim fees) to Deposit Account No. 18-0988.

Respectfully submitted,

RENNER, OTTO, BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP



Mark D. Saralino
Registration No. 34,243

DATE: August 19, 2004

The Keith Building
1621 Euclid Avenue
Nineteenth Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44115
(216) 621-1113
C:\GEN\MAR\Smarsp145.aaf3.wpd